



2FW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : **Confirmation No. 5015**
Hideki HIGASHITANI : Attorney Docket No. 2004_0066
Serial No. 10/758,129 : Group Art Unit 3729
Filed January 16, 2004 : Examiner Donghai Nguyen

WIRING TRANSFER SHEET AND METHOD
FOR PRODUCING THE SAME, AND WIRING
BOARD AND METHOD FOR PRODUCING THE SAME

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE
FEES FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Restriction Requirement, the Applicant hereby elects the invention of Group I, claims 1-6, directed to a method of producing a wiring transfer sheet. In view of the election of Group I, the Applicant further elects Species IA, Figures 5a-5e, and claims 1 and 2 read on the elected Species IA.

The Applicant also respectfully traverses the Examiner's Restriction Requirement between the invention of Groups I and II. As noted in the Office Action, the invention of Group I is directed to a method of producing a wiring transfer sheet, while the invention of Group II is directed to a wiring transfer sheet. In particular, the invention of Group II is directed to the wiring transfer sheet as recited in claim 7 and produced according to the method of claim 1. Therefore, the wiring transfer sheet of claim 7 includes all of the structural components of the wiring transfer sheet as recited in elected method claim 1.

As explained in MPEP chapter 803, a proper Restriction Requirement between patentably distinct invention requires:

(1) that the inventions are independent or distinct; and

(2) there is a serious burden on the Examiner if Restriction is required.

Because the wiring transfer sheet of Group II contains all of the structural components recited in the method of elected independent claim 1, there would be no additional burden on the Examiner to examine both elected Species IA of Group I and Group II. Consequently, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the requirement to elect a single invention (i.e., a method or the product made) as set forth in item 1 on page 2 of the Office Action of January 18, 2006. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the requirement for restriction between the inventions of Groups I and II.

In view of the above, a full examination on the merits of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Hideki HIGASHITANI

By: 

W. Douglas Hahm
Registration No. 44,142
Attorney for Applicant

WDH/ck
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
February 17, 2006